

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Indemnification Provisions and Limits on the Amount of Damages Are Inherently Inconsistent with the Professional Role of Financial Advisors.	1
	A. Indemnification Permits Conduct below the Standard of Care.	1
	B. Financial Advisers, like Attorneys, are Professionals.	2
	C. As a Professional, DrKW Should Be Held to the Highest Level of Care.	4
	iv. The Logic Behind Court Decisions Refusing to Allow Securities Underwriters to Enter Indemnification Contracts with their Issuer Clients Supports a Ruling by this Court Refusing to Allow PG&E to Enter an Indemnification Agreement with DrKW	4
III.	Indemnification Provisions Are Especially Inappropriate in a Chapter 11 Case Where Debtor's Professionals Have a Fiduciary Obligation to the Estate.	6
	A. As PG&E's Investment Adviser, DrKW Has Special Legal and Public Duties	6
	B. PG&E's Employment Contract with DrKW is Not in a Purely Commercial Environment	7
	C. On April 6, 2001 when PG&E Filed a Chapter 11 Petition, the Standard for an Appropriate Professional Contract Changed.	8
	D. Potential Negligence Claims against DrKW are Property of the Estate, not PG&E	9
IV.	The Agreement to Have Disputes Decided in New York Pursuant to New York Law Is Not Consistent with this Court's Jurisdiction to Control Employment Terms and Fees	11
V.	Conclusion	11